Measuring Unrecorded Measurement.

M. Revzen and A. Mann
Department of Physics, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel
(Dated: April 15, 2016)

Projective (Von Neumann) Measurement of an operator (i.e. a dynamical variable) selected from a prescribed set of operators is termed unrecorded measurement (URM) when both the selected operator and the measurement outcome are unknown, i.e. "lost". Within classical physics a URM is completely inconsequential: the state is unaffected by measurement. Within quantum physics a measurement leaves a mark. The present study provides protocols that allow retrieval of some of the data lost in a URM.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta;03.67.Hk

arXiv:1604.04110v1 [quant-ph] 14 Apr 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Within quantum mechanics a measurement (the present study is confined to Von Neumann, i.e. projective, measurements, [1, 2]) has important effect. This remains true for a measurement of an operator, selected from a prescribed set of operators, with neither the measurement outcome nor the operator chosen being available, i.e. are "lost". We refer to such measurement as "unrecorded measurement" (URM). E.g., confining ourselves to a two dimensional Hilbert space, with measurement of the spin along the x direction for a particle whose spin is aligned along the y direction. The measurement outcome has equal chance of being $+1$ or -1. Let the outcome be $+1$. This is a URM measurement if neither the direction (here x) nor the outcome (here $+1$) are available (are "lost"). Nonetheless the state of system has changed: the particle did enjoy a (Von Neumann) measurement. QM, [3], assures us that should we measure the particle's spin along the x direction the result would be $+1$. We seek a protocol prescribing "control measurement" that will disclose (some) of the changes in the system that underwent a URM. The study below considers setups allowing retrieval of (some of) the unavailable data of a URM. We note that these are purely quantum in nature as within the classical theory URM is completely inconsequential and leaves, in principle, no trace.

Our strategy is to entangle our system (particle "1" - the system that will undergo a URM) with an ancilla (particle "2") [1]. The URM, though pertaining to particle 1, affects both systems and we shall extract the information we seek from both. This is achieved by a two-particles control measurement of the combined system.
The (single particle) URM bases that we consider for a d-dimensional Hilbert space particle are mutually unbiased bases, MUB. To assure self containment and to fix the notation we now give a brief review of MUB [4–14].

Two orthonormal vectorial bases $\mathcal{B}_1,\ \mathcal{B}_2$ are said to be MUB if and only if $(\mathcal{B}_1 \neq \mathcal{B}_2)$

$$\forall\ |u\rangle,\ |v\rangle \in \mathcal{B}_1,\ \mathcal{B}_2\ resp.\ |\langle u|v\rangle| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}. \tag{1}$$

A set of orthonormal bases which are pairwise MUB is a MUB set. It was shown in [11] that there are at most d+1 MUB in a set belonging to a d-dimensional space. For d=prime ($d \neq 2$), d members of an MUB set are given in terms of the (d+1)-th basis $\{|n\rangle\}, n = 0, 1, ...d-1$ by (b designates a basis, m specifies the vector in the basis)

$$|m; b\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{n=0}^{d-1} |n\rangle \omega^{\frac{b}{2}[n(n-1)]-mn};\ b = 0, 1, ...d-1;\ \ \omega = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{d}}. \tag{2}$$

The (d+1)-th basis, termed the computational basis (CB), is the set of eigenfunctions of the enumerating operator $\hat{Z}$:

$$\hat{Z}|n\rangle = \omega^n |n\rangle. \tag{3}$$

We shall designate this basis with b=$\ddot{0}$; i.e. $|n\rangle = |n; \ddot{0}\rangle$: Thus, the d+1 bases are $b = \ddot{0}, 0, 1, ...d-1$.
We adopt the following abbreviation, [14],$|\ddot{m} >= |\ddot{m}; b = \ddot{0} >$ and $|m_0 >= |m_0; b = 0 >$. We note, for future reference, that the basis b=0 is made of the eigenfunctions of the shift operator $\hat{X}$,

$$\hat{X}|n >= |n+1 >;\ |n+d >= |n >;\ \ \hat{X}|m; 0 >= \omega^m |m; 0 > . \tag{4}$$

i.e. it is the Fourier transform of the CB. Note that the exponents are modular and may be viewed as members of an algebraic field [5–7, 15].
The URM we consider involves measuring an operator $\hat{K}$ of the general form

$$\hat{K}_b = \sum_m |m; b > \omega^m < b; m|; \;\; b = \ddot{0}, 0, 1, ...d-1, \tag{5}$$

for some selected alignment (=basis), b. The URM considered is a measurement of $\hat{K}_b$, Eq.(5), of particle 1 with an outcome m in a basis b with the values of m and b unavailable, lost. Both the initially prepared state and the control measurement basis involve entangled systems: particle 1, the system subjected to the URM, and the ancilla, particle 2.
We shall show below that there are two "natural" control measurements that provide distinct pieces of information. These are measurements of MUB of maximally entangled states (MES) bases. (The MES considered here are pure two particle states such that partial tracing over either one leaves as unity the density matrix of the other.) The presentation of these MES is simplest with the use of collective coordinates which are now introduced schematically [13–15].
The Hilbert space of two d-dimensional particles, 1 and 2, is spanned by $|n_1 > |n_2 >,\; n_i = 0, 1, ...d-1,\; i = 1, 2$ where $|n_i >$ is the eigenfunction of $\hat{Z}_i$, (i=1,2) corresponding to Eq.(3), with similar relation for the shifting operators, $\hat{X}_i$, viz $\hat{X}_i|n_i >= |n_i + 1 >$, Eq.(4). The space may, alternatively, be accounted for with collective coordinate $|n_c > |n_r >$, $n_j = 0, 1, ...d-1,\; j = c, r$. Here c stands for "center of mass" and r for "relative" coordinates. These are defined for a d-dimensional Hilbert space (d$\neq$ 2) via the single particle dynamical variables (recall, [7, 13], that the exponents are modular variables, e.g. $1/2 = (d+1)/2\; Mod[d]$), d=odd prime,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{Z}_c &= \hat{Z}_1^{1/2}\hat{Z}_2^{1/2};\;\; \hat{Z}_r = \hat{Z}_1^{1/2}\hat{Z}_2^{-1/2};\;\; \hat{Z}_j|n_j >= \omega^{n_j}|n_j >;\; n_j = 0, 1, ...d-1.\; j = c, r \\
\hat{X}_c &= \hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2;\;\; \hat{X}_r = \hat{X}_1\hat{X}_2^{-1};\;\; \hat{X}_j|n_i >= |(n+1)_j >;\; j = c, r; \\
\hat{Z}_j\hat{X}_j &= \omega\hat{X}_j\hat{Z}_j;\;\; \hat{Z}_i\hat{X}_j = \hat{X}_j\hat{Z}_i;\; i \neq j;\; i, j = c, r\;\; \hat{X}_j^d = \hat{Z}_j^d = I;\; j = c, r.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

One may consider MUB for the c and r coordinates for the d+1 bases. We, however, concern ourselves with the two collective coordinates MUB , the CB, $b = \ddot{0}$, and its Fourier transform, b=0. We label the CB bases of the collective coordinates in close analogy to the particles ones. Thus the "center of mass", c, CB basis, i.e. the eigenfunctions of $\hat{Z}_c$, are $\{|n_c >\} = \{|n_c; \ddot{0}_c >\}$, $n_c = 0, 1, ...d-1$,. With similar designation scheme for the eigenfunctions of $\hat{X}$, the b=0 case. (We shall omit the basis subscript, e.g. $\ddot{0}_c \Rightarrow \ddot{0}$. Whenever possible confusion may arise between values of b for the collective coordinates with those of the single particles it is removed via a detailed specification.)

Direct calculation proves [13, 16] that each $|n_1 > |n_2 >$ state corresponds to a unique collective state $|n_c > |n_r >$:

$$|n_1 > |n_2 > \Leftrightarrow |n_c > |n_r >;\; \text{with } n_c = \frac{(n_1 + n_2)}{2};\;\; n_r = \frac{(n_1 - n_2)}{2} \Leftrightarrow n_1 = n_c + n_r;\;\; n_2 = n_c - n_r. \tag{7}$$

Adopting the following notational simplification for both c and r, [14], viz.

$$|\ddot{n} >_i \equiv |\ddot{n}; b = \ddot{0} >_i;\;\; |n_0 >_i \equiv |n_0; b = 0 >_i;\;\; i = c, r\;,$$

we now prove that the product collective state $|\ddot{m} >_c |2m_0 >_r$ is a maximally entangled state (MES). Indeed

$$\begin{aligned}
|\ddot{m} >_c |2m_0 >_r &= |\ddot{m} >_c \big[\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{n=0}^{d-1} |n >_r \omega^{-2m_0 n}\big] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\sum_{n=0}^{d-1} |\ddot{m} + n >_1 |\ddot{m} - n >_2 \omega^{-2m_0 n},
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where we used Eq.(7). The last expression is obviously a MES, QED.
Now the d^2 MES: $|\ddot{m} >_c |2m_0 >_r,\; \ddot{m}, m_0 = 0, 1, ...d-1$, are orthonormal and span the two d-dimensional particles Hilbert space and thus form a (MES) basis for it. This MES basis defines a conjugate basis made of the d^2 MES: $|\ddot{m} >_r |2m_0 >_c,\; \ddot{m}, m_0 = 0, 1, ...d-1$, (r and c are interchanged). The two bases are MUB:

$$| < \ddot{m}'|_c < 2m'_0|_r |\ddot{m} >_r |2m_0 >_c | = \frac{1}{d};\; \text{independent of } \ddot{m}, \ddot{m}', m_0, m'_0. \tag{9}$$

Either basis may be used as a retrieving control measurement. Thus one control measurement involves measuring the operator

$$\hat{\Gamma}^a = \sum_{\ddot{m},m_0} |\ddot{m}\rangle_c |2m_0;0\rangle_r \Gamma^a_{\ddot{m},m_0} \langle\ddot{m}|_c \langle 0;2m_0|_r, \tag{10}$$

This operator involves the double (commuting) collective operators, Eq.(6). (This control measurement relates the NSM issue to the so called Mean King Problem [15, 18, 19].) The other, conjugate control measurement involves measuring

$$\hat{\Gamma}^b = \sum_{\ddot{m},m_0} |\ddot{m}\rangle_r |2m_0;0\rangle_c \tilde{\Gamma}^b_{\ddot{m},m_0} \langle\ddot{m}|_r \langle 0;2m_0|_c, \tag{11}$$

$\hat{\Gamma}^b$ involves the double (commuting) collective operators conjugate to those of Eq.(10) it relates to the so called Tracking the King problem [15].

II. MEASURING UNRECORDED MEASUREMENT

We now outline two protocols wherein measuring a URM allows retrieval of some of unavailable data of a URM of a d-dimensional particle 1: Let Alice prepare the MES $|\ddot{m}>_c |2m_0>_r$, [16, 17],wherein particle 1 and an ancilla, particle 2, are (maximally) entangled.
Now let Bob measure $\hat{K}_b$, Eq.(5), with an outcome m. (The basis (b) of the measurement and the outcome (m) are not available to Alice.) The state of the two particle system is now (unnormalized)[1], using Eqs.(2),(7),(8),

$$\begin{aligned} |m;b>_1 <b;m|\ddot{m}>_c |2m_0>_r &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} |m;b>_1 |-m";-b>_2 \omega^{\phi}, \\ & m" = 2(m_0 + b\ddot{m} - b/2) - m;\ \phi = -\frac{b}{2}(2\ddot{m})(2\ddot{m}-1) + 2\ddot{m}m. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Let Alice select, as her control measurement, to measure $\hat{\Gamma}^a$, Eq.(10), having as her outcome, say, $\Gamma^a_{\ddot{m}',m'_0}$. Thus she is assured that the following matrix element is non-vanishing ($b \neq \ddot{0}$):

$$0 \neq < \ddot{m}'|_c < 2m'_0|_r |m;b>_1 |-m';-b>_2 \Rightarrow\ m'_0 + b\ddot{m}' = m_0 + b\ddot{m}. \tag{13}$$

This implies (note: the equations are modular)

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \frac{(m_0 - m'_0)}{(\ddot{m}' - \ddot{m})}\ \ddot{m} \neq \ddot{m}'. \\ &= \ddot{0}, \quad m_0 \neq m'_0, \quad \ddot{m} = \ddot{m}'. \\ &= \text{undetermined for } \ m_0 = m'_0, \ \ and \ \ \ddot{m} = \ddot{m}'. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The last two results are obtained upon evaluating the matrix elements that include $b = \ddot{0}$, i.e. the possibility of Bob measuring $\hat{K}_{(b=\ddot{0})}$.
The protocol above reveals the basis used in the URM except for the case wherein the outcome of the control measurement recovers the initially prepared state which would also be the case wherein no measurement, either the usual or URM, were performed. In such a case the outcome of the control measurement does not reveal any of the sought after data.
Equivalent results are gotten when Alice prepared state is the conjugate state: $|\ddot{m}>_r |2m_0>_c$ and correspondingly, the control measurement is $\hat{\Gamma}^b$, Eq.(11).
An alternative protocol for the unveiling of (some) of the data of a URM is one wherein we proceed as above but replace the control measurement $\hat{\Gamma}^a$, Eq.(10), with $\hat{\Gamma}^b$, Eq.(11). In this case an outcome of the control measurement, $\Gamma^b_{\ddot{m}',m'_0}$, assures the non vanishing of

$$0 \neq < \ddot{m}'|_r < 2m'_0|_c |m;b>_1 |-m';-b>_2 \Rightarrow\ m - 2(m'_0 + b\ddot{m}') = 2(m_0 + b\ddot{m} - b/2) - m. \tag{15}$$

This implies,

$$m = (m_0 + m'_0) + b(\ddot{m} + \ddot{m}') - b/2. \tag{16}$$

i.e. this protocol unveils a relation between the basis, b, and the outcome, m, of the URM. (Note: this case is closely related to the so called Mean King Problem [12, 14, 18, 19]: it allows the deduction of the outcome, m, given the basis used, b.

III. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS

An Unrecorded Measurement (URM) is a projective (Von Neumann) measurement of an operator, selected from a prescribed complete set of operators, with the measurement outcome and the operator selected unavailable, "lost". Such a measurement is completely inconsequential within classical physics (CP) since within CP a measurement leaves the measured system essentially unperturbed. Within quantum mechanics (QM) the measurement marks the measured system. Two distinct protocols were considered in the present work, each involving a distinct control measurement whose outcome reveals some of the "lost" data of a URM.
The protocol prescribes a state preparation wherein the particle to be measured without record is entangled with an ancilla. The correlations involved in the entanglement reveal, via the outcome of the respective control measurement, the sought after data.
The present study is confined to d-dimensional Hilbert space particles with d an odd prime as for these dimensionalities complete sets of mutual unbiased bases (MUB) are known. The extension of the theory to d being a power of prime is possible but is judged to require complicated mathematics without adding physical insight. The case of d=2 requires a special treatment which is left for future work.

The essential role played by entanglement in the unveiling change of the quantal state due to (projective) measurement relates to the intimate relation among entanglement, measurement theory and thence to the uncertainty principle.

---

[1] S. M. Barnett, *Quantum Information*, Oxford University press, Oxford (2009).
[2] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* Cambridge U. Press (2000).
[3] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: concepts and Methods*, Kluwer Academic publishers, Dordrecht (1993).
[4] J. Schwinger, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **46**, 560 (1960).
[5] W. K. Wootters, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **176**, 1 (1987).
[6] W. K. Wootters and B. D. Fields, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **191**, 363 (1989).
[7] K. S. Gibbons, M. J. Hoffman and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062101 (2004).
[8] A. Vourdas, Rep. Math. Phys. **40**, 367 (1997), Rep. Prog. Phys. **67**, 267 (2004).
[9] S. Bandyopadhyay, P. O. Boykin, V. Roychowdhury and F. Vatan, Algorithmica **34**, 512 (2002).
[10] A. B. Klimov, J. L. Romero, G. Bjork and L. L. Sanchez-Soto, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. Phys. **40**, 3987 (2007); Ann. Phys. (NY), **324**, 53 (2009) .
[11] I. D. Ivanovich, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **14**, 3241 (1981).
[12] T. Durt, B.-G. Englert, I. Bengtsson and K. Zyczkowski, J. Quant. Inf. **8**, 535, (2010).
[13] M. Revzen, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 012113 (2010).
[14] M. Revzen, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 075303 (2013).
[15] M. Revzen and A. Mann, Quant. Studies: Math. Found. QSMF-15-00036 (2016).
[16] A. Kalev, A. Mann and M. Revzen, Phys. Rev. Lett., **110**, 260502(2013).
[17] A. Kalev, A. Mann and M. Revzen, Eur. Phys. Lett., **104**, 50008 (2013).
[18] L. Vaidman , Y. Aharonov and D. Albert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1385 (1987).
[19] B.-G. Englert and Y. Aharonov, Phys. Lett. A., **284**, 1 (2001).